REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-25 and new claim 26 will remain in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite.

Claims 6 and 12 have been amended to overcome the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,262,984 to Rochberger ("Rochberger") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,401 to Modiri et al. ("Modiri").

The Action states that Rochberger teaches transmitting a group membership file including information indicative of client memberships in two or more groups, citing col. 3, lines 15-23. However, it is clear from Figure 1 and associated text that each of the nodes only belongs to one peer group. The Hello messages sent by nodes to their neighbors only include their own peer group membership. Accordingly, Rochberger does not teach or suggest "at a system host, transmitting a group membership file to a plurality of clients including said first client, the group membership file including information indicative of client memberships in two or more groups" because the Hello messages don't indicate memberships in two or more groups. Furthermore, the Hello messages are sent by each node to its neighbors, and

hence cannot be considered transmitted from a "system host" as claimed.

The Action concedes that Rochberger doesn't disclose dynamically grouping clients, citing Modiri to account for this deficiency. However, Modiri doesn't teach transmitting a group membership file, and Modiri cannot make up for this deficiency in the primary reference. Modiri discloses that "computer nodes exchange proposed membership lists" (col. 7, lines 46-47). Each proposed membership list is only for one group (a "cluster") (col. 7, lines 44-46). A preferred membership list for the cluster (which consists of one group) is then chosen (col. 7, lines 48-49).

Neither Rochberger nor Modiri teaches or suggests, either alone or in combination, "at a system host, transmitting a group membership file to a plurality of clients including said first client, the group membership file including information indicative of client memberships in two or more groups". Accordingly, applicants submit that claims 1-22 are allowable.

Claims 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rochberger in view of Modiri and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,159 to Woodward et al. ("Woodward").

Woodward is merely cited for its disclosure of a wireless communication network. None of Rochberger, Modiri, and Woodward teaches or suggests, either alone or in combination, "at a system host, transmitting a group membership file to a plurality of clients including said first client, the group membership file including information indicative of client memberships in two or more groups". Accordingly, applicants submit that claims 23-25 are allowable.

Enclosed is a Enter $ amount check for excess claim fees.
Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit
account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 29, 2004

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

/BY
KENYON S. JENCKES
REG. NO. 41,873

PTO Customer No. 20985
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10420784.doc